

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed February 14, 2006, the Examiner took the following action: (1) rejected claims 1-2, 7-8, 14, 17-18, 24-25, 27-28, and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Groves (US 6,485,247); (2) rejected claims 3-4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Groves; (3) rejected claims 5-6, 16, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Groves in view of Gesuale (US 6,019,565); (4) rejected claims 9-10, 19-20, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Groves in view of Ross (US 4,690,606); (5) rejected claims 32-33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Groves in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA); (6) rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Groves in view of the AAPA and Gesuale.

The Examiner acknowledged, however, that claims 11-13 and 21-23 would be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of their respective base and intermediate claims. Applicants express appreciation to the Examiner for acknowledging the presence of allowable subject matter. Without additional comment and without prejudice as to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants have amended claims and canceled claims in order to expedite the issuance of the subject matter acknowledged as being allowable, and without prejudice to the filing of subsequent divisional or continuation applications to pursue allowance of one or more of the rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### *I. Allowable Subject Matter*

Claim 1 has been amended to remove the limitation added by Applicants in the Response to Office Action filed on or about January 26, 2006, and to include the limitations of claim 11 (and intervening claim 10), placing claim 1 in condition for allowance as indicated in the Office

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Action mailed Nov. 21, 2005. Claims 10-11 have been canceled. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 has been amended to remove the limitation added by Applicants in the Response to Office Action filed on or about January 26, 2006, and to include the limitations of its base claim, placing claim 12 in condition for allowance as indicated in the Office Action mailed Nov. 21, 2005. Claim 13 depends from claim 12. Accordingly, claims 12-13 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 21 (and intervening claim 20). Claims 20-21 have been canceled. Claims 15-19 depend from claim 14. Accordingly, claims 14-19 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 has been amended to include the limitations of its base claim. Claim 23 depends from claim 22. Accordingly, claims 22-23 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 24 has been amended to recite the limitations of claims 11 and 12, either alternately or in combination, which claims the Examiner acknowledged as being allowable. Claims 25-31 depend from claim 24. Accordingly, claims 24-31 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 32 has been amended to recite the limitations of claims 11 and , either alternately or in combination, which claims the Examiner acknowledged as being allowable. Claims 33-35 depend from claim 32. Accordingly, claims 32-35 are now in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-9, 12-19, and 22-35 are now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining matters that may be handled by telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: April 12, 2006

By: Dale C. Barr  
Dale C. Barr  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 40,498  
(206) 315-4001 x106

60483

CUSTOMER NUMBER